

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-4 and 6-18 remain pending. In this Reply, Applicants have amended claims 1-4, 7, 12, 15, and 17. Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 4-5, 7, 12, and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims. In this Reply, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the features of allowable dependent claim 5 (now cancelled). Claim 4 has been rewritten into an independent claim. Furthermore, Applicants have amended claims 2, 7, 12, and 15 to depend on claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims should be indicated as allowable based on reasoning set forth above.

Prior Art Rejections

1. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection - Yata

Claims 1, 3, 6, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Yata et al. (U.S. Patent 4,708,435). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Initially, the rejection of claims 1, 6, and 16 has been rendered moot by the amendment to claim 1 present above. Therefore, Applicants address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 insofar as it applies to claim 3.

Independent claim 3 is directed to a diffuser panel for diffusing light in a rear projection screen, comprising: a diffuser panel including first reflecting elements, for condensing light to substantially one spot or one line, periodically provided in at least one direction between a light incident surface and a light exiting surface. The first reflecting elements are a plurality of types of reflection regions having different directivities of diffusion provided periodically.

Therefore, the diffuser panel in claim 3 has periodically-provided reflecting elements that form a plurality of types of reflecting regions having different directions of diffusion (e.g.,

vertical direction diffusion and horizontal direction diffusion). Applicants direct the Examiner's attention, for example, to page 21, line 20 – page 22, line 13 of the specification.

In rejecting claim 3, the Examiner recites column 3, lines 31-37 of Yata. Applicants note, however, that this portion of Yata merely describes a rear projection screen having a plurality of prisms. As shown in Fig. 6, these prisms have the same configuration on the rear surface of the rear projection screen. See e.g., column 3, lines 28-31. Yata fails to disclose or suggest the diffuser panel arrangement recited in claim 3.

According to MPEP § 2131, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claims.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Yata fails to anticipate claim 3, and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

2. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 2, 8-10, 13-14, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yata in view of Knox (U.S. Patent 6,788,460). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yata in view of Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent 4,468,092). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 1 presented above (incorporating features of allowable dependent claim 5) and the amendment to claim 2 (rewritten as a dependent claim, dependent from claim 1) have rendered the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 9, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant